## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

RICKIE L. HILL,

Case No. 3:14-cv-00680-RCJ-WGC

**ORDER** 

Petitioner,

٧.

RENEE BAKER, et al.,

Respondents.

Before the court are four motions filed by petitioner Rickie L. Hill in his *pro se* habeas matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Respondents have filed a motion to dismiss certain grounds in the petition, for the most part based on failure to exhaust (ECF No. 15). This court has previously granted Hill at least two motions for extension of time to file an opposition (see ECF Nos. 24, 38).

Currently, Hill's main complaint appears to be that he is being housed in the infirmary in Ely State Prison and that he has only been given some of his legal work since he was moved. Specifically, he asserts that he does not have the state-court preliminary hearing transcript (ECF No. 41). Hill attaches two grievances regarding his legal work. Both indicate that Hill was admitted to the prison infirmary with chest pain. A grievance response dated June 1, 2018, states "your property will follow in due course," and a grievance response dated June 2, 2018, states "there are no restrictions on your property" (ECF No. 42, pp. 3-4). Thus, it appears that Hill will receive his legal work while in the infirmary.

Moreover, at this stage in the litigation, respondents have moved to dismiss several grounds for failure to exhaust, that is, failure to present them as federal constitutional claims to the state's highest court. Respondents also move to dismiss some grounds as conclusory. It is possible that Hill will need hearing transcripts to respond when the respondents answer the petition's merits, but he does not need the preliminary hearing transcript in order to respond to whether or not certain claims are unexhausted.

Additionally, Hill filed a motion for production of minutes of the oral argument before the Nevada Supreme Court on the appeal of the denial of his state postconviction habeas petition (ECF No. 39). The court knows of the existence of no such minutes. In any event, the relevant Nevada Supreme Court document is its order affirming the denial of the petition. Finally, Hill has filed a motion for stay until counsel is appointed (ECF No. 40). No motion for appointment of counsel is pending, and this court has previously denied three motions for appointment of counsel filed by Hill.

Accordingly, Hill's motions are denied. The court will grant Hill one final thirtyday extension to respond to the motion to dismiss.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the following motions filed by petitioner: motion for production of documents (ECF No. 39); motion to stay case until counsel is appointed (ECF No. 40); and motion to produce voluntary statement (ECF No. 41) are all **DENIED** as set forth in this order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner's motion for extension of time to oppose the motion to dismiss (ECF No. 42) is **GRANTED in part**. Petitioner shall file and serve his opposition to the motion to dismiss, if any, within **thirty (30) days** of the date this order is entered.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner is expressly advised that, absent extraordinary circumstances, the court will grant no further extensions of time to oppose the motion to dismiss.

DATED: 18 June 2018.

ROBERT C. JONES UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE